28

1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 DAYMAN EARL CHATMAN, SR., No. C-11-4066 EMC (pr) 9 Plaintiff, **ORDER** 10 v. 11 CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et 12 Defendants. 13 14 15 Defense counsel informed the Court's Clerk that, when he attempted to e-file the motion for 16 summary judgment on September 7, 2012, the Court's electronic filing system had been shut down 17 for maintenance scheduled to occur over the weekend. Defendants' motion for summary judgment, 18 filed September 9, 2012, is deemed to have been timely filed. 19 Although the Court provided a *Rand* notice regarding summary judgment in the order of 20 service, a relatively new case requires that Cefendants provide to Plaintiff a new Rand notice 21 regarding summary judgment at the time they file a motion for summary judgment. See Woods v. 22 Carey, 684 F.3d 934, 940-41 (9th Cir. 2012). Defendants must provide the Rand notice to Plaintiff 23 no later than **September 17, 2012**. 24 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 26 Dated: September 11, 2012 27

United States District Judge